

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/889,178	BRIAND ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Maury Audet	1654	

Status of Application: *Pending*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 4PM

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was telephoned to amend the claims, as well as rejoin some claims, as part of putting the application in condition for allowance (pending an updated prior art search). It was agreed that claims 12-13 and 16-17 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 14-15 rejoined, in their entirety. Claim 18 amended to now read "A pharmaceutical composition comprising, as active ingredient, at least one pseudopeptide as claimed in claim 1, and a pharmaceutically acceptable excipient.

These amendments were agreed upon to put the application in condition for allowance. However, an updated prior art search revealed a 102(a) reference teaching certain claims of the invention (Limal et al., Tetrahedron Letters 39 (1998) 4239-4242) which included inventors Limal and Briand, as well as another author Quesnel, not named as an inventor. See attached second action non-final..